PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Chief Minister).—Sir, I lay on the Table the following Reports of companies as required under Section 639 (2) of the Companies Act, 1956 :—

(1) Annual Report of the Radio and Electricals Manufacturing Company Limited for the year 1957.

(2) Annual Report of the Mysore Lac and Paint Works Limited for the year 1957.

(3) Annual Report of the Mysore Sugar Company Limited for the year 1957.

(4) Annual Report on the working of the Hindustan Aircraft Limited for the year 1957-58.

— —

DEMANDS FOR ADDITIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS FOR THE YEAR 1960-61.

(*debate contd.*)

†Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjangud).—Sir, I am happy that the Finance Minister is here ; but, I do not know why he has changed his seat. (*laughter*). Sir, I think, it is a healthy convention to explain what exactly the salient features of this Supplementary and Additional Demands. In any case, whatever might have been the practice in the previous sessions, in this particular session, there was a great need for an explanation from the Finance Minister to explain the folly and callousness of the Government in bringing before us a Supplementary Demand to the tune of 16 crores of rupees. Sir, it is true that the Budget is only an estimate on which you may not determine the standard of efficiency of the Council of Ministers. It is admitted in all budgets, whatever State it may be and whatever type of Government it may be, some various are permissible. But the question is, what exactly the size or percentage of the variation to the total demand made in the main budget is ? Sir, I do not wish to be very harsh on this Government. One of my colleagues in the other House is reported to have called this as a hoax and fraud. But, I do not wish to be so harsh.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He can also say it ; but why does he force it on somebody else ?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—It is published in the papers ; but I do not want to use those words. If I call this, is a kind of a camouflage or a financial jugglery, I think it will meet the end. This Supplementary Demand is the worst type of all canons of orthodox budgeting. I want to ask two or three things to the Finance Minister. Sir, this is the third instalment of Supplementary Estimate.

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

According to me, roughly, it will be 20 crores of rupees. It is 16 now, it was 3.65 crores on the first two estimates presented in September. I want to know if any classification has been made for the supplementary and additional expenditure under different categories under normal expenditure, plan expenditure and non-plan expenditure and how much is the total amount paid out of the contingency funds up to-date. The Hon'ble Finance Minister will remember that I raised this issue on a previous occasion and it is in pursuance of that I think that last time, they prepared a statement and put it in our hands. This year again, we want to know what exactly is the amount paid out of the contigency fund and what amount is on credit in the contigency fund up to-date. That statement is not here. According to prescribed procedure, it is necessary that Government should furnish this information in the proper form. That will be a serious omission because while presenting to the Legislature estimates for all expenditure financed from the contingency fund, a note to the following effect will have to be appended to such demand, that is, that payment of such and such transaction has been ordered by the Finance Department in the particular form prescribed. This has not been done in this case.

Another important omission is that Government has not furnished Government orders relating to the sanction of expenditure and payment out of the contingency fund. I do not know why it cannot be placed and why it has not been placed. We cannot say that in every case, the amount can be automatically paid out of the contingency fund. It is only in every exceptional circumstances that the Finance Department can make an order that it may be paid out of the contingency fund. All the explanations furnished are very casual, mechanical, not giving details as to why it was considered necessary that this amount should be met out of the contingent fund. It is also not noted here in the large majority of the cases, where explanations have been submitted, why an expenditure of this magnitude could not be foreseen and included in the budget papers.

Another omission which I found is that Government have not furnished to us details as to whether the supplementary demands granted on previous occasions have or have not been fully utilised. I wish to come to this a little later when I come to the non-implementation of the second five-year plan to the tune of nearly 10 to 15 crores. On this occasion, I am interested in emphasising the fact that they should have made a mention of the amount of supplementary grants that they got sanction from this House which has not been fully utilised and if not why it was not utilised. Simply because Article 205 of the Constitution provides for another statement being placed before the Legislature, Government cannot take liberties with expenditure in excess of the contingent fund or out of other funds. Even if they want to sanction a lakh of rupees out of the contingent fund, a very clear case has to be made of. It looks from the statement furnished to us that it is all taken

to be a mechanical process, say some Head of Department wants 10 lakhs or one crore and it automatically finds a place whether it is treated as a new service or excess of expenditure. After all what is the scope under the Contingent Fund Act of 1957 and the rules made thereunder. The limit is 2 crores, but I am not bothered of the amount provided or sanctioned by that Act. But are the rules being followed ?

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Sir, under Article 205, the Government can avail itself of the opportunity of making demands for supplementary grants only once that where they have exceeded in their expenditure or whether a new service not contemplated in the original budget is undertaken. But under Article 205, I am clear that the Covernment can take advantage of presenting Supplementary Demand only once.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member has been late in raising the point. It ought to have been raised in the first instance.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—The delay does not matter. It is better to be late than never.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Let the Hon'ble Member Sri Mallaradhya finish his speech and I will give a ruling.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—The point raised by me is important. If the presentation of Supplementary Demand is illegal, the debate becomes useless.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—If the grants are not made, what is the fate ?

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Lakhs of rupees have already been spent. What happens to that money ?

† Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—Sir, the objection raised by my friend is absolutely without any basis. My friend has neither followed nor has the capacity to appreciate and understand the nature and scope of that Article. It only says that Government shall cause to be submitted supplementary demands for grants after the original budget is passed. It does not prescribe how many times it may or may not be submitted. Government can submit them any number of times, even a thousand times. When a law is to be interpreted, you cannot introduce your own fancy into it. When a need arises, Government can cause any such supplementary demands to be placed on the table of the House. I do not understand from where he got this idea that it can be presented once only. If there is no restriction, it gives unrestricted power to the Government.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—I had a great regard and respect for my friend Sri Kothawale. I know he is a law graduate but he has not practised in any court, as I understand from his talk just now.

(Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM)

A careful reading of Article 205 would show that such demands can be made only once. I will read the portion :

> " cause to be laid before the House or the Houses of the Legislature of the State another statement showing the estimated amount of that expenditure or cause to be presented to the Legislative Assembly of the State a demand for such excess, as the case may be ".

The words 'another statement' and 'a demand' clearly shows that supplementary demand can be made only once after the regular budget.

Mr. SPEAKER.—After having read very carefully I come to the conclusion that Sri Arumugham is not correct because of one thing. I will show what it is. " cause to be laid before the House another statement showing the demand for such excess. " That means not only another statement. It may be two or three statements. 'Another' does not mean only one. It may be two or three in excess. There has been one excess and it has been voted by the House. There is another and that has to be voted. If there is any further excess, that also becomes another demand. That is my interpretation. Of course, there is room for Sri Arumugham to differ from me and I think my interpretation is correct.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—"cause to be laid before the House another statement showing the demand for such excess ".

Mr. SPEAKER.—After all, there is only one demand in respect of a grant. There cannot be two demands for a Department. For one item, there can be only one Demand in excess of what has already been granted.

Sri M. RAMAPPA.—But they have certain Demands which come neither under (*a*) or (*b*) it may not be a case of insufficiency of money as granted by the original Budget or a new service not contemplated at the time of the Budget.

Mr. SPEAKER.—After all the Government can also ask money for a new service. That is very obvious.

Sri G. VENKTAI GOWDA.—My friend wants to say that there are some items which do not fulfil the conditions prescribed either under (*a*) or (*b*).

Mr. SPEAKER.—Government can come here whenever they spend more on a supplementary demand or the Government can come here for spending money on a new service. If they can show that there is an item about which money has not been spent in excess but still they have come on a Demand, it is for them. But there cannot be an item for which there is no excess Demand or a Demand for new service.

Sri M. RAMAPPA.—Can a Demand be made indiscriminately merely because there is article 205. What is the sanctity of the original budget under 204 ? It will be lost. It is not sufficient if merely it is a new service, it must be one which must not be contemplated when the original Budget was presented to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—A new service is one which could not be contemplated before. It must be absolutely necessary. You cannot treat it as a new service which was contemplated before and for which money has been asked.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Sir, the very idea of presenting a Budget is that it is not allowed for them to present every month a supplementary Demand. It means that only once a year they can present a supplementary Demand. That is what the makers of the Constitution have presumed. How can they present half-a-dozen supplementary budgets ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—After all, whether Supplementary or Additional Demand, Government can come as many times as they can. The only thing is that it is not good for the Government to come as often as they can. But they must come only once in a year. He can say that and it is a suggestion for action.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—I want to show you a ruling in this respect, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He may show that ruling and I will revise it.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I am glad that this interruption has come at the proper time. In regard to the supplementary estimates, it is said that they shall be presented to the Legislature at the first Session of the Assembly immediately after the advance sanctioned. This is what is said in the rules contemplated under the contingency Fund Act. There are a number of these supplementary or additional Demands made in these budget papers that were placed before the House. They were sanctioned in August or September. There was a Session in the month of November. I do not know why the supplementry Demands were not placed immediately when that Session was held in November. I will refer to the particular Demand when I take you through the several items. That is the most important objection I raise on this occasion.

Sir, the public are rather shocked at the way in which the present Ministry are bringing this sort of repeated supplementary and additional demands in such big magnitude. I want to ask the Hon'ble Finance Minister if he can point to any other State in India which has large sums of expenditure Demanded in this way or whether this kind of bad planning and bad anticipation of the budget is in evidence in any other State ? It is of interest to us because we want to judge our standards of administration in Mysore.

One other important matter which the Hon'ble Finance Minister may kindly clarify is I wish he had made a preliminary speech in introducing the supplementary Demand these questions would not have been raised by me. What is the source from which these additional items are to be paid for ? If it is only to be restricted to the lumpsum provided under the Contingency Fund of two crores, it is different. I know the Finance Minister may say that there are certain items which are partly set for in the demands made herein.

Sri T. MARIAPPA (Minister for Finance).—Why can't you refer to para 4. That will save part of the trouble. I know my friend has taken all the trouble to go through this and getting further information and all that. But I want him to read the introductory memorandum para 4.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I am coming to that.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—But let him say what is the other course of having these adjustments.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Granting that out of these 14 crores of this third instalment, 3.65 crores of the second instalment of the supplementary demand providing for all adjustment of 640 lakhs in the other statement which you placed in September, you have said in the Annexure very clearly that you are going to make adjustment of a sum of 640 lakhs, which means in effect that all the supplementary demands would be of the order of 14 crores putting together 1, 2, 3. Now, I am asking the question, from what source are going to meet this additional expenditure ? Is that not a relevant question to be asked when a supplementary Demand is made ?

Sri K. F. PATIL.—Will the Hon'ble refer to page 39 in regard to another Demand ? It is only an adjustment from one head to another. Practically 77 lakhs is to be adjusted that is all.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I must say that after all the supplementary adjustments can be of the order of 640 lakhs, not more. It may be less.

2-30 P. M.

If the Hon'ble Minister for Transport refers to page 39, there is no cash transaction involved there. I have also taken that into account. The net deficit of Rs. 640 lakhs which I have mentioned includes all the amounts. So the question now is from what source you are going to meet this additional supplementary expenditure. Is it out of any reserves that the State has built up, and what proportion of those reserves are you going to deplete. Are you justified in making demands on the reserves built up for a specific purpose ? Why is it that you have not mentioned anything of that kind while presenting the supplementary demands ? Do you expect to make good this deficit from additional revenues ? If so, what are the sources from which you expect this additional revenue ? Should you not give that information to this House ? I expect an answer to this from the Finance Minister.

Then another more important question is' what is the effect of all these supplementary demands on the budget of 1960--61 presented to this House in February--March 1960 ? Is it going to be a surplus budget or is it going to be a deficit budget ? If so, of what order ; what would be the position of the revenue surplus budget and what would be the over all position of the State budget ? Are not these matters material to the issue on hand ?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Can all these be disclosed now ? That will be dealt with in my budget speech.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Then how can we sanction these supplementary demands ? In the budget for 1960-61 you showed us the sources of income and the items of expenditure. But you are now asking us to sanction these supplementary demands without telling us the source from which you are going to get it. Without letting us know the source, how can you expect this House to vote these supplementary demands.

Then I would like to ask, how is this going to react on the revenue surplus that you showed in your budget.

One other impression that any body would be led to infer from a casual perusal of these statements is that there is a tendency to rush expenditure at the fag end of year. There are certain departments where as much as Rs. 50 to 60 lakhs are being asked for in the month of February when even up to the end of December not half that amount has been spent. I will substantiate my statement later when I come to the actual demands. My inference is that you want to show on the one side that the financial targets of the second plan are more or less fulfilled by asking for these demands. It is open to you to say that my inference is wrong. Possibly, these amounts have been asked for as supplementary demands and not included in the original budget because you did not want to upset your surplus budget into a deficit budget. Even according to the statement made by the Treasury Benches the achievement of financial targets of the second plan is put at not more than 90%. That means roughly Rs. 15 crores will not be spent out of the Rs. 136 crores sanctioned for the second plan.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—The facts so far disclosed put it at 97% and we have yet to review the position.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Even then I would say that not less than Rs. 10 crores out of the second plan outlay will remain unspent. I am prepared to take a challenge on that and wait for the budget speech. When my friend Sri Puttaramaiya was speaking the Finance Minister is stated to have intervened in the debate and said that if we want to keep the tempo of the plan expenditure and if we are to convince the Third Finance Commission, we have got to show that we are spending quite a lot of money which we can reasonably spend. Does the Finance Minister think that it is easy to convince the Third Finance Commission? If he thinks that he is going to hoodwink it in this matter, he is sadly mistaken. I do not wish that we should go on asking for additional grants on that ground. We should place before them real facts. We should be one when we go before the Finance Commission, but we should ask only for our legitimate share. But the way in which these supplementary demands are asked does not justify it. If the Hon'ble Members on this side had carefully seen the supplementary demands before, they would have made this one of the grounds of the no

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

confidence motion that was moved by them against the Ministry. The very fact that such a statement has been placed before the House justifies the move that we made in placing this no confidence motion before the House. I know the way and the circumstances in which the no confidence motion was disposed of by this House, but if there is a possibility of calling for a certain referendum in the State with reference to the proceedings connected with the no confidence motion, I am sure the results would be very revealing. Is such a thing possible ? That is one of the democratic ways of ascertaining public opinion.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—The general elections are coming. That is like a referendum.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—My friend Sri Kothawale is looking forward to the elections. It is not such an easy matter. I do not want to be very dogmatic. He has perhaps reason to be dogmatic. They are already arming themselves with power, resources, money. I am not going to take notice of it. We on this side are prepared to submit ourselves to a referendum on this issue. Why not the ruling party submit themselves te referendum. It is my friend Mr. Kothawale who provokes me to say what happened in our absence. Our friends indulged in the most vulgar abuses. One outstanding thing is, they never answered a single point to the point. That is the extraordinary performance which was abundantly in evidence in the papers.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He abandoned his own chariot and went away.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I do not know why the Minister for Finance has not mentined a word about the new Ministers. They were sworn to in the month of February ; it may be on the last day of February. You will have to draw the salary of the Ministers and their establishment, their drivers, etc. Can they draw that money this year without the sanction of the Legislature ? I am not speaking of Ministers in Andhra. There is duplication of pattern in Andhra.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—A supplementary statement has to be presented to the Legislature when the original is found to be insufficient.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—You have not said that you will find the amount by appropriation.

Mr. SPEAKER.—After all, for the four Ministers, and their staff, they must come to the House for money. At that time the Hon'ble Member can speak about this.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Don't you expect that when a supplementary demand is placed before the House, they must be true to fact ? My friend Sri Channabasappa waxed eloquent against me. He has also said that I am wanting in chivalry. It seem to be the public talk that the speech made by him is like Hanuman's tail. I was the target of attack. I wish he had been chivalrous to some of the senior

officers of Government and show ordinary courtesy. He teaches me about chivalry. With people who are about to retire in a month or two he displays no chivalry but cruelty and vindictiveness.

My friend is said to have made a criticism about my Youth Festival business. I have got the official report on my table now.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He can refer to it in a couple of days.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I want to make an observation in connection with that.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He can make observations on Superintendents, that is, other charges. After all, he will have a very good opportunity of speaking.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Please take Demand No. 9 on page 8. After so many years of supplementary budgeting, at every stage they want the Accountant General to point out to them when an item should be a charged item. Take Demand No. 10. Even in the matter of preparation of supplementary demands at the Secretariat level, they do not even know the distinction between charged item and voted item of expenditure. Demand No. 10. In respect of Item Nos. 2 and 3: "Many works are in good progress and according to the outlay to end of December 1960, the sanctioned grants under these heads have exceeded by more than 50 percent...". What is the sanctity attached to a budget, if the sanctioned grants have exceeded by more than 50 per cent. I want to know whether the Finance Ministry has any agency in controlling the expenditure. Sir, let me refer to item 10—restoration of tanks and contruction of new tanks and pick ups, etc. I am not bothered whether it is restoration or tanks of new tanks.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—So far as Minor Irrigation is concerned, we wanted them to spend more.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Is that the idea of sanctioning the Budget Sir? This Ministry has freely allowed to spend more than 6 to 7 crores when money is not available. Is this sound budgetting? It seems as if they yielded to pressure from their people.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Sir, the Hon'ble Member himself has remarked in this House that Madras has exceeded the target and we must also spend more.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.— Is it a defence? Has the Government decided on a priority? I wish the construction of schools in the villages should get the priority because they are held under the trees.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—I want to consult the House that so far as irrigation is concerned, even if it exceeded, whether it must be spent.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Then, you must take a vote of the House. It does not lie with the Finance Minister to allow the administration to run amuck. I am finding fault because in the system of budget, there is no control of this Ministry.

Sir, coming to the question of debt and other obligations. In the Explanatory Note you can se how callous this Government has been.

"The interest for one half year for the 4 per cent Mysore State Development Loan 1969 falls due on 28th February 1961. A provision of Rs. 8,75,458 required for payment of the interest due during the current year is included under this head." Do you mean to say that these were one of those expenditures which could not have been foreseen? By what stretch of imagination it could be said that this amount should come under the Supplementary Budget ? What answer the Finance Minister has for this?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Sir, it was not due and therefore, we did not make any provision.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, in regard to Demand No. 13-General Administration, etc. I want to invite the attention of the Finance Minister to items 1 and 5. They have created certain posts of Audit staff in their order dated 17th October 1959. They treated it as a New Service and sanctioned 57,000 rupees in January 1961. Sir, what is the time lack between 25th January 1961 and 17th October 1959? When they sanctioned the additional staff, they should have realised the need or the expenditure also. But, they still say that this is an expenditur under New Service. Why did you not allow this expenditure to be provided in the budget of 60-61? Then, Sir, how much of this Rs. 51.000 is recurring and how much of it is non-recurring? I am asking this question with a view to determine whether you have satisfied the the concepts of New Service. Why is it, in all these cases you did not classify under recurring and non-recurring? Before you decide whether a particular service is new Service or not there is a finance minimum fixed. I am saying this because when the efficiency of administration is criticised by the opposition, you say, it is a vague allegation. Here is a concrete instance to show either you are callous or you are inefficient.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Please see the last line: a token grant of Rs. 100 is asked.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—In asking for a token grant, does it mean that you are not spending the money? If it is a question of reappropriation, you have the power. Why should come before the legislature? Every Departmental Head has got power for reappropriation.

Then, Sir, coming to Resources and Economy Committee the less said the better. 30,000 rupees is provided for this. This is an item which this section of the House is definitely not in favour of sanction. They refuse to sanction. Sir, this is a committee constituted purely on party considerations and to meet political exigencies.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Sir, let him consult his friend Mr. Ramappa.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—He is one who has emphatically stated that this is a committee which is not at all necessary. There is no administrative necessity justifying the constitution of this committee. You could have constituted a committee of the Legislature. Here is a committee where they have taken an ex-Minister. They wanted to provide some job to people who were defeated. Sir, what happened to the recommendations of Raghavendra Rao Committee?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—How does it apply to the new State of Mysore?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—What exactly is integration? Has it affected the revenues? If you had given effect to one of the recommendations in regard to uniform laws, yon could have got lot of money. They could not do this because it is motivated by party considerations and political exigencies are to be satisfied.

I am asking as to how many men of experience are there on the Committee. The party wanted to give a job to somebody who has retired or he was defeated and therefore they were given places on the Committee. The Government did not take into consideration the valuable recommendations of Committees of your officers or committees presided over by the head of the State who has done valuable services to the State.

Sri T. N. MUDLIGIRI GOWDA:.—Suppose the Hon'ble Member is defeated in an election, does it mean he is inferior.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—It is not the case with intelligence. intelligence can never be defeated. I may tell my friend, for whom I have the greatest affection that intelligence and defeat in elections have nothing to do with each other. I am asking whether there are any State reasons or State considerations which prompted the Government to constitute a Committee and waste public funds. After all, what exactly were the resources have when first Plan was drafted, when the Second Plan was drafted and what economics have not been suggested by the previous Committees. Apart from that objection, I object to the Government not having stated the term of the Committee. Is it going to sit indefinitely or is it going to be for one or two years?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—No.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—You have not stated anything in the explanation. You merely ask for thirty thousand rupees. We do not know whether it is recurring or non-recurring. You say that a new service is created but you do not give details. How do you expect us to accept your statements.

The House adjourned at Five Minutes past Three of the Clock and re-assembled at Forty Minutes past Three of the Clock.

[Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair.]

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Mr. Speaker Sir, now I shall not refer again to those anamolies about the concept of new service and my objections which I put forward about this particular aspect.

I am now going to item 13 on page 15, Sir. There is an item shown—item No. 35 which relates to a payment of Rs. 8,63,724.32 in respect of royalty on street-lights in Mysore City Municipality. It is not clear from the explanation as to why Government should pay this sum. No where does the explanation appear, as to how this is a legitimate charge on the State Government-ornamentation of street lights. Is this the practice everywhere or is it by virtue of any agreement or is it a concession shown to Mysore City Municipality? No where in the explanation is that point mentioned. I want to know what exactly is the point. However it is said that in the regular budget a sum of 6 lakhs is provided and after protracted correspondence, the matter is pending for 6 to 7 years. That thing is very obvious and I do not wish to comment about that matter.

My next point is about police on page 18 Demand No. 17. Sir, under item 3 it is said that an original budget grant of Rs. 50,000 under advances was sanctioned in July 1960. It is anticipated that the total expenditure against this is 150,000. Not a single explanation is forthcoming. Details are lacking. In the very nature of things, it must be something emergent and unforeseen. But for what purpose is this amount given? Is it secret purpose? If it is secret purpose, I do not question at all. But if it is emergent and unforeseen, at least I consider some explanation should have been forthcoming. Even that has not been furnished in the explanation.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Your guess is correct. Secret Service.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—In respect of item 4 this is one of those cases where I want to justify the statement which I have made earlier that this rush of expenditure to work the financial targets of the Second Five-Year Plan or even the normal expenditure here is a case. It is said:

> "the sanctioned grant was Rs. 5 lakhs included in the budget of 1960-61. During the year sanction was accorded for the purchase of vehicles at a cost of 24 lakhs."

I want to know if the original sanction is five lakhs, how Government could sanction to the Home Department an expenditure of 24 lakhs? It did not stop there. They say, "considering the time-lag involved in the actual receipt of vehicles and the adjustment of their value, in respect of the vehicles procured through the Director-General of Supplies and Disposals, it is anticipated that the total expenditure under this head would be Rs. 14,000. Hence, it is proposed to supplement the grant by a sum of Rs. 9,00,000 to meet the pending bills as well as the bills anticipated to be received for paymet during the current year." It looks rather whimsical that Government do not know their mind and

if 24 lakhs was necessary, why they did not sanction at the beginning of the year and include it in the Budget?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Suppose we did not receive the vehicles in time, five lakhs would have been sufficient. Subsequently we have received it and because we received it in time, we are making this Demand.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—You sanction 24 lakhs as against five lakhs. If you had at least given us the sequence, we would understand it. When did the Director-General intimate you that the vehicles would be available during the year. They have a programme for the allotment of vehicles to the different States on a priority basis. You should have anticipated this. I am only saying how lakhs and lakhs of rupees are being utilised and the whole thing is done in a whimsical manner. It is not realistic. That is my criticism.

Then I turn to page 19-Demand No. 19. There are one or two items which are not explained at all. I do not know whether the Hon'ble Finance Minister felt that no explanation was forthcoming. Under items 6 and 7 on page 19-Development of a museum at Bangalore and at Mangalore. If it is the museum under geology and mining, there is already a departmental museum at Bangalore which is fairly good and well-equipped and which is even in the process of development. There is no explanation forthcoming. Possibly it is only a sum of Rs. 42,000. Is it suggested that this could not be anticipated as part of the Second Five-year Plan? This is an item of work included in the Second Five-Year Plan. Is this planning at all? If you had the least thought that it was necessary to establish two museums under the Mineral Development Board under the Second Five-Year Plan, you should have included in the plan itself you should have iucluded in the Budget. You have not done it and you do not even consider that even an explanation is called for as to why this additional sum is included at the supplementary stage. It looks so funny!

With regard to demand No. 20, a token grant has been asked for the Universities of Mysore and Karnatak. I am only concerned with the Mysore University. There are certain recent developments which should open the eyes of the present Ministry and they should refuse to give any grant at all till an Enquiry Commission is set up in regard to the maladministration of the University. I am speaking with a full sense of responsibility. I do not wish to go into the details since one or two matters connected with this form the subject matter of a writ petition, but outside those matters the administration of the University warrants such an enquiry. I have sustained more than 18 charges against the administration of the University and the Vice-Chancellor and that matter is forming the subject matter of interpollation which is to come up here. That question has been admitted and I am awaiting the answer to it. Having regard to those charges which are of a very serious nature and the administrative lapses and mal-administration, I consider that this

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

House should not vote a single pie for the administrative expenditure of this Mysore University. I do not wish to say anything about the Karnatak University.

If I may pin-point the actual accusation in regard to the Mysore University, you have sanctioned 49 posts of Lecturers and 14 Lecturers for a period of only one year. If you will see the requirement, you cannot treat this at all as an item of new service. I do not know why they call this a new service. This offends against their own definition of 'new service', and still they go on saying that this is new service.

Sri ANNARAO GANAMUKHI.—What is the definition of new service?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I have got the Government Order defining this. It is dated 17th February 1960. It says that additional staff for normal increase of work of a purely temporary nature in any Government department need not be treated as new service.

Then I come to item 7-expansion of elementary education which is in the Second Plan. I am happy in one sense that 500 additional teachers were appointed during the year 1960-61 for upgrading the elementary schools. It was a very desirable reform which was welcomed and appreciated; but I cannot understand the appropriateness of treating it as a new service. It offends against the definition of 'new service'.

Then I come to demand No. 21, page 22. I do not understand what exactly is the point involved in this demand. When did the Government of India sanction this additional Central assistance for increasing the number of admissions in the existing medical colleges. The explanation makes things more complicated. The Central assistance for this scheme is only for one year under the Second Plan. It need not have come as a new service. The explanation might be that it could not be included in the plan scheme for 1960-61.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—The Government of India said that they would give us additional assistance for increasing the number of admissions.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—To justify the inclusion of it as a supplementary demand, what is the date on which the Government of India intimated this sanction to you? This is all normal expenditure. Then in another item the explanation says: "Though sanction was accorded for the creation of posts of full-times Professors, purchase of cars, stationery..." Are these items of a very unusual nature as to be included as new service? See how unrealistic all this is!

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—We were also thinking of increasing the number of admission . Luckily there was windfall from the Government of India.

Sri J. B. MALLARADAYA.—This question of increasing the admissions in the various medical colleges in the several parts of the State has been the subject matter of representation to the Government of India for a number of years past. When did you actually get the sanction? What

was the appropriateness of including this as a new service in the supplementary demands?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—That was after the last budget was passed.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—In that case in all these cases you can give an omnibus explanation that the item was sanctioned after the passing of the budget. Where it is convenient you are giving an explanation, and where it is inconvenient you are giving no explanation at all.

Then on page 25, in respect of agriculture, there is an item which relates to the establishment of a sugar-cane research station in Mysore State. When I am making all these remarks and observations, let not the Finance Minister be led away by the impression that I am against development expenditure.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Not at all.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—They made all kinds of scandalous allegations in our absence. I do not want to indulge in that. What I want to say is that there is no financial propriety in these transactions and in these demands I am glad that the research station is going to be established, but what is the expenditure involved and is it justified as a new service? The Government Order says: "As a rule expenditure on experiments and investigations need not be treated as new service. However all expenditure of this character incurred each year without fruitful results should be reported to the Accountant General for incorporation in the Appropriation Account with suitable explanation for report to the Public Accounts Committee in due course". Where was the necessity of bringing this item as new service.

Then in regard to the demand for industries, against item 12 on page 27, a big sum of Rs. 9,49,172 is shown as payment in settlement of dues for the purchase of parachute silk. It is a charged item I do not know if discussion is permissible.

4-00 P.M.

This is one of the instances where the Government cannot justify this amount being charged to the State finances. They have not realised the responsibilities of the Government. They have entered into an agreement and a kind of compromise with a private capitalist without exercising due care and vigilance at the appropriate time and have involved the Government in a needless expenditure of Rs. 9 lakhs where it could have been settled perhaps for at least one-third of the total amount. This is the allegation I am making against the Government. This is one of the cases where no due regard has been paid to settling claims well in time and it is due to the inordinate delay involved in dealing with this case in a proper manner.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—How are we responsible?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—You are definitely responsible.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—I think he knows the whole case pretty well.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I was also a witness in the case. It is in abundant proof that it is entirely due to the laches of the Government that the Government is involved in an extraordinary expenditure which might have been cut down to one-third. This is one of those instances which is at the back of the minds of the Government in trying to refuse a license for the starting of a paper mill in Nanjangud because the proprietor of this particular mill involved the Government in payment of Rs. 9 lakhs due to their negligence. The Chief Minister, is supposed to have said that there is no sense of discrimination to local industrialists. This is a major venture or enterprise involving a sum of Rs. 6 crores, the scheme of a paper mill. The reason why I am saying is that in this particular case, the matter has not gone through the State Industries Development Council. When the question of the fertiliser factory council came up, we went into detail, we got the technical opinion, then we depended on the report of a committee set up by the Government of India. On the question of establishment of sugar factories, we decided a scheme of propities, where it should be located. We have taken decisions. But in respect of a major industry, no such decision has been taken by the Industries Development Council as a matter of policy. When correspondence has been going on for a number of years for the starting of a paper mill, an outsider comes and puts in an application for the starting of a rayon factory. They do not recommend the case of a local industrialist. It is this expenditure of Rs. 9 lakhs which is at the back of the mind of the Government and how is he responsible? He puts forward a claim of Rs. 14 lakhs and the Arbitration Committee has awarded Rs. 9 lakhs. How can the Government of India issue a license to an industry in Mysore without the concurrence and the active support or the recommendation of the State Government, I cannot understand. In a similar case in the Madras Government Mr. Kamaraja Nadar refused to give concession. He said : I am not prepared to give the concession unless they revoke the decision. "Are the interests of the local industrialists safe guarded by this attitude? The only inference possible is that merely to satisfy the whims and fancies of a few people for reasons best know to them, the Chief Minister is trying to put down the local industrialists.

In regard to increased rates for Sandal-wood Oil and increase in the Sandal-wood auction rates, it is stated in the Explanatory Note:

> "According to the recent decision of Government the Sandal-wood Oil Factory has to pay Sales-tax on sandal-wood supplied by the Forest Department from 1st October 1957, which is estimated at Rs. 8.10 lakhs..."

What exactly is the Government Order I want to know because this is likely to be questioned.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—In the case of all sales of timber.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA—It raises a very important issue. I will raise it in the budget discussion.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—It is a question of assessment.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—What about supply of charcoal to Bhadravati?

In regard to Bhadravati, that item is not included. The policy which you adopt with respect to a particular industry in public sector should be made applicable to all industries.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Wherever there is assessment of sales-tax, they are bound to pay.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—If you will see Demand No. 27, Rs. 47,00,000 for Sandal oil factory; Rs. 11 lakhs for Government Soap Factory; Rs. 10–12 lakhs for the Government Porcelian Factory... "For this Porcelain Factory, we are going on increasing the capital expenditure. I feel that the Finance Minister who should be the uncompromising guardian of the finances of the State should not waste money on the Porcelain Factory. My blood boils when I see anything done for this Factory. I want to know whether we should shut down the factory or mend it properly. My important remark in respect of this Demand is that this does not indicate any plan so for as industrial production is concerned. In regard to public sector undertakings, did you phase the programme of expansion or development in the beginning of the Second Five-Year Plan. What is the fun of asking merely Rs. 80 lakhs for two or three of these concerns. Does it show planned programme or development of industrial expansion.

On page 28,

> "Item No. 12.–Government in their Order No. CI 315 SSI 58, dated 21st September 1959 have passed orders that the work of conducting Techno–Economic Survey in respect of (i) Forests and Forest Industries and (ii) Small Scale and Rural Industries and Marketing of their Products, may be entrusted to the National Council of Applied Economic Research, New Delhi. The estimated expenditure on the above work is Rs. 1,02,740. No provision was made in the current year's Budget....." They took a decision that the work of conducting techno–economic survey should be entrusted to the National Council as far back as September 1959. When once they took a decision, did they not ask for proposals.....

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—We did not get it in time. They said that they would send their Bill. Only on the 15th February, the expenditure was sanctioned.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—You therefore sanctioned an advance. On what basis, the advance was sanctioned?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—After some work was done they paid advance.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—In regard to Demand No. 29, I cannot congratulate the Finance Minister, nor can I recognise that a Finance Ministry exists in the State, at the rate at which they allow expenditure to go on in excess of paid Budget sanction. Here is a case where under the grant for 1960–61 Rs. 40 lakhs was provided for Roads-Minor, the expenditure up to end of December 1960 was Rs. 86 lakhs; that is, the expenditure has increased by more than 100 per cent.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—You kindly recall what the House said when the scarcity conditions occurred. The House said that we must spend more money and we must give more employment. Therefore, we have bridges and roads programme in each taluk. 50, 60 and even 70 miles have been taken up.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, if the Hon'ble Minister is referring to the rural communication. I should say it is a sheer waste of public funds. All that is a waste. This is not the type of road programme that should be taken up. Even now it is the moot question as to who should take up the maintenance work of these roads. I have travelled in Mandya, Mangalore and Bangalore Districts and I know, some kind of rural communication work is done. I understand that some amount of waste is always inevitable. My question is why is this particluar department being favoured like this ?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—The House has said that we must give more money for providing drinking water, roads and irrigation wells to each village.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, this morning the Minister for Local Self-Government said that there are 6000 villages in need of drinking water well which is the responsibility of the Village Panchayat.

†Sri T. SUBRAMANYA (Minister for Development and Local Self-Government).—Sir, it is true that I said so. If a supplementary had been put. I would have explained every thing. It should not go unexplained. We have provided money to such of those Village Panchayats who cannot afford to have a drinking well. The money will be found out of the ten per cent of land revenue that is in possession of the Government. We have issued instructions to all the Deputy Commissioners to have a phased programme to spread over a period of five years so that all the 6000 villages may have drinking water wells. If a particular Village Panchayat has no funds, on the recommendation of the Deputy Commissioner, we will instruct the Divisional Commissioner to allow funds from out of the land revenue that is in possession of the Government to the extent to ten per cent.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Gubbi).—Sir, the statement of the Minister amounts to leakage of budget proposals. I think the Minister for Local Self-Government has anticipated the provision made by the Finance Minister in the budget to be presented yet.

†Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—Sir, I have declared openly on the floor of this House from the beginning of the year that 6,200 wells would be finished within the Third Plan. Now it is the responsibility of the Village Panchayat according to the Village Panchayat and Taluk Boards Act. The amount is there ; it need not be provided in the budget. I am not disclosing any secret of the budget. Ten per cent of the land revenue will be with the Government and it is left to the discretion of the Government and we will instruct the Divisional Commissioner to allow certain funds to the various Panchayats so that they may have their wells dug; the responsibility is theirs. They have to find out their contractor and find out where it should be dug, etc. We only come to their rescue financially.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I think, it is within the memory of the Finance Minister and the Local Self-Government Minister that this of supplying pure drinking water to every village is there ever since the Malnad Development Committee was inaugurated. I suggested to open a register to indicate to Government the number of wells. I know lot of public fund is wasted on this. To-day, it is stated at 6,200 and I do not wonder if it goes to 8,500 some time later. Sir, what is actually going on now ? Moneys are being drawn for wells which are already in existence; moneys are drawn for wells which never exist. Now, at least you must have a statement showing the number of wells just as there a register for tanks. Otherwise, will it not be a duplication of efforts and funds ?

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—We will follow it if it is not already followed.

Sri G. N. PUTTANNA (Tumkur).—Even in the N.E.S. 'aval thakta' is not being prepared in each village.

ನೀವು ನನ್ನಂತೆಯೇ ಹಳ್ಳಿಯವರು, ಮುಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದ ತಕ್ಷಣ ಮರೆತು ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಂದು ಗಾಜ್ರುಪುಕೆಕ್ಕೆ ಏನೇನು ಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದರ್ಮಪಟ್ಟಿ ಇವತ್ತಿನವರೆಗೂ ತಯಾರಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದೆರಡು ಮನೆಗಳಿರುವ ಕಡೆ ಬಾವಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಹತ್ತಿಪ್ಪತ್ತು ಮನೆಗಳಿರುವ ಕಡೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಎಷ್ಟು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನೀವು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಮಾಡಿ ಈ ತರಹ partiality ಬೇಡ.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—Let the panchayats do it now.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—With regard to the Bhadra Reservoir left bank channel and Tunga anicut channel, mentioned on page 38, Demand 42, we do not know when the service was opened and when water was let out. What is the staff contemplated. Are these proposals received from the head of the department. Here is an explanatory note which I wish had not been made or printed. What is the use of that expenditure ? It is not clear when this was opened for service and water. We are of course glad to hear that they have been opened for service. Why this lumpsum grant is asked for? It is not normal. You cannot ask for lumpsum grant unless you have proposals before you and unless you can allocate expenditure, both recurring and non-recurring. You cannot ask for lumpsum grants in supplementary demands.

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

There is another very serious blunder Committed by this Government. They do not seem to have understood the implications of Section 93 of the States Reorganisation Act of 1956. Throughout the explanations offered there seems to be a misreading or misinterpretation of the words. Where it should be voted, they brought it as charged and where it ought to be charged, they got it under voted items.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—It is never done.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ಇಲ್ಲಿ 30 ಲಕ್ಷ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ಪ್ಲಾನ್ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಂಡಿಚರನ್ನು ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ Work out ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಾ?

Page 40.

> " The State Government has accepted a debit of Rs. 17.6 lakhs towards reimbursement of commutation amount in respect of mixed Jagirs which was passed on by the Government of Andhra Pradesh. According to provisions of section 93 of S. R. Act, 1956, all sums payable by any one State to the other State shall be "charged" on the Consolidated Fund of the State concerned. Since the provision for the above item of expenditure is made in the 'voted' section in the current years' budget, the provision in the 'charged' section is now included."

This shows that the reading of Section 93 of the S. R. Act at the Secretariat level is confused. Let them read it properly.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—We have admitted the mistake. Wherever there is a mistake we admit it.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—How can such a mistake be Committed. Is it that the Finance Department is not aware as to what is a charged item and what is a voted item.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—There is another instance to show the lack of sense of proportion in the Ministry, whether it is the Finance Ministry or the P. W. D. I am referring page 41, Demand No. 46, item No. 1. " Formation of one Public Works Department Circle, two Divisions and ten sub-divisions with the necessary staff for taking up the work of the Malaprabha Project was sanctioned by Government in G. O. dated 24th September 1960....." I want to know whether there is a reasonable prospect of this 30 lakhs being spent before the end of the current year and if so for what purpose. Should not the explanation furnish details as to how 30 lakhs is going to be expedited. This is clearly an indication of the Government's lack of vision. They try to do things without any purpose or plan. How is this a new service, again.

Take Demand No. 48, page 43. There are some items, all relating probably to Jamkhandi. Item No. 3 says that "Jamkhandi water

works is in progress and expenditure to the extent of Rs. 45,332 has already been incurred. Additional grant is necessary to regularise the expenditure and to meet the anticipated outlay during the current year". I am asking whether this is in order. It is a very vague explanation, in fact. I do not consider it as an explanation at all.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—It is an improvement to existing works.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—You please let us know what is the truth behind it. Is this a claim included in the new service? It relates to health schemes. I am asking if this health scheme was undertaken in the beginning of the second plan, was it taken up without the total expenditure being ascertained in the beginning?

Take this very important demand, so far as I am concerned—Demand No. 49, page 44—Capital outlay on industrial development, which is of the order of one crore of rupees. Take item No. 3:

> "Sanction was accorded for the purchase of 180 chassis with cabine inclusive of Excise Duty, Sales-Tax and delivery charges and building of bodies, etc....."

For one thing, I am not prepared to accept this as a new service and for another, when there are so many private agencies for undertaking, carrying contracts in respect of transport of minerals, why should Government indulge in this luxury.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—No private firm was willing to transport them without chassis.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Have you advertised in the gazette.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Not necessary.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The Finance Minister was in-charge of road transport. He was never in the habit of deciding things without calling for tenders from body builders. For distrist development committees, chassis were supplied afrer calling for tenders. In this case how is it without calling for tenders or quotations things were decided. You decided on nationalisation of road transport in the State.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—These are the chassis bought. Body-building will be over. You do not immediately think that it will be operated by the Government. That is only the next stage.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.— I have noted the tendency of the Finance Mitister to justify unjustifiable things. It is a question of buying 180 chassis for the State. I will not oppose it for the simple reason that these 180 chassis will become available to Mysore State. To that extent there is sufficient justification.

4-30 P.M.

But my point is, could you have transferred these 180 chassis to private individuals who could have done the target for you?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—That is the next stage.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—How did you sanction 40 lakhs of Rupees out of the contingency fund ? Where was the urgency ? Where was the exceptional circumstances justfying the transfer of 40 lakhs to the contingency fund ? You are doing depredations on the contingency fund !

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Please listen to my explanation. It is a question of purchase first. What you say is organisation of transport. Therefore, now we are still in the first stage Mr. Mallaradhya.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Today, if Government make up their mind to give over all the 180 chassis, I could find ready buyers within four days. I am sorry to say that this is absolutely irregular and this is not the carrect way of running the Government. This is the inference that anyone could draw from the explanation. Your explanation makes it worse. Has the Mineral Development Board which Government have constituted recently accepted this principle ?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—What principle ?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The principle of carrying manganese ore to the west coast with their own agency ?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Let him put forward the proposition. We will have it examined. However, it must be said that Government decided to buy the chassis and run the organisation by itself. Or, you can suggest an alternative. It is very difficult for private individuals to acquire chassis. That is why, we had to acquire chassis through the good offices of the State Trading Corporation. Now that it is acquired, you can suggest a second stage that Government should not handle it through their own agency. You are quite at liberty to suggest it.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, you mention the State Trading Corporation. It has ruined the trade of the country, I tell you. Here is a mineral Development Board consisting of officials and it is a Government officer who is the Director of the Mineral Development Board. Such being the case, they are treating the Mineral Development Board and the Government of Mysore as worse than private individuals and my objection to this supplementary Demand is that there was no justification for charging 40 lakhs to the Contingency Fund and that this is not covered by the policy acceptable to the Government now was the House told about what was likely to be done. Even if there was necessity for 180 chassis, the correct thing for them to do was to invite tenders from private individuals who were willing to purchase these chassis on behalf of the Government.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Even now they are willing to buy.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—There is another thing. My friend the Finance Minister has to say this. There is something wrong. All my four budget speeches are not answered.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—You do not believe what should be done inregard to chassis. These were not available for purchase except

through the good offices of the State Trading Corporation. We have purchased them for the purpose of transporting minerals under the auspices of the Mineral Development Board. What is your objection ?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—My suggestion is, let the Government of Mysore invite tenders through their own department and enter into a contract with a few private people who are ready to supply the manganese ore to the porthead. You prescribe any conditions, call for tenders and give it to the people who give the lowest quotation acceptable to you. What is your objection ?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—That is the second stage. Therefore it will be borne in mind.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Why did you charge 40 lakhs to the Contingency Fund ? Where was the urgency about it. You should not have paid it at all out of the Government money. Supposing 10 cars are allotted to Mysore State, of which you have allotted one to me. Do I not pay money ?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—With regard to the Chassis, the story is different. Unless the chassis are at your command, you will not pay.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—When the Government of India intimated that all the 180 chassis are available, you should have circularised to all the intending buyers. Why didn't you do it ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ಗದಗ್.—ನರ್ಕಾರ ಮತ್ತು ಖಾನಗಿ ಎರಡೂ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದು more economical ಆಗಿರುತ್ತದೋ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಯುವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೋ ? ಅಥವಾ ಮತ್ಯಾವ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದರಾದರೂ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೋ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಎರಡು ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಂದಲೂ.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Is it not a fact that the people who have got motor services which have been nationalised, have they not approached this Government with a request that if they are permitted to buy these 180 chassis and transport the ore to the West Coast ?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—All the suggestions will certainly be borne in mind.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—My question is, have they approached this Government ? Have they not said that they will do the job for the Government ?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—You will please wait for the reply.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, there are more serious things so for as this particular item of expenditure is concerned.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ಗದಗ್.—ಕೆಲವು ರೂಟುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನರ್ಕಾರೀ ಮತ್ತು ಖಾನಗೀ ನರ್ವಿನ್ನು ಗಳನ್ನು ಜಾಯಿಂಟಾಗಿ ಎರಡನ್ನೂ ಇಡುತ್ತೀರೋ ಅಥವಾ ಕೆಲವೇ ರೂಟುಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರವೆಂದು ಇಟ್ಟು ಆ ರೂಟ್‌ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೋಗತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಬಸ್ಸುಗಳ ಮೂಲಕ ಈ ಓರನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸುತ್ತೀರೋ ? ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನರ್ಕಾರದ ಯೋಚನೆ ಹೇಗಿದೆ ?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—The whole thing is under examination as yet. The second stage has not yet come. We will positively bear in mind all the suggestions given by the Hon'ble Members.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, the other point of objection is, the purchase of chassis must have taken place in the month of August 1960 according to you. We met in December. I want to know why this particular demand was not placed before this House and its approval taken for this expenditure of 40 lakhs ? Is it not necessary that under the Rules framed under the Contingency Fund Act ? Is it not obligatory for Government that they should bring such a supplementary Demand in the next session after incurring the expenditure ? This is one more serious offence which I consider should not have been committed.

Sir, in regard to one other item on page 45, there are two items really...

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—We have given the dates of the Government orders. It was finally settled on 7th February 1961.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—That is why I wanted all the Government Orders to be placed on the Table. The Government order relating to 7th February relates to the building of bodies.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—As and when the chassis were received, we had passed the order.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Whatever it is, this is an item of expenditure for which you could never find any justification. I am reading item No. 8 on page 45:

> " The Central Warehousing Corporation has agreed to make a further contribution of Rs. 2.00 lakhs towards the additional share capital of Rs. 4.00 lakhs proposed to be raised by the State Warehousing Corporation. The State Government is therefore required to make available a sum of Rs. 2.00 lakhs as its share towards the share capital of the State Warehousing Corporation during the current year. Hence this demand."

I am sorry the items are wrongly numbered. I think items 7 and 8 ought to be interchanged. There is a mistake evidently.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—If there is a mistake in printing, I will correct it with thanks to the Hon'ble Member who points it out.

Sir, items 7 and 8 may be interchanged.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—So far Warehousing Corporation is concerned, I wanted to know if it is a committed expenditure. Supposing during next year they make a contribution of 40 lakhs, can you pay another 20 lakhs as your share ? The explanation that you give must be convincing. But the explanation given by you under this head is nothing but mechanical, casual unconvincing and unacceptable.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—If you want a more laboured explanation, we will give all the information available.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The very first thing is you have not given us the amount of money charged as contingent account last year. You gave it to us after the session was over. Similary, you have not furnished it this year also. Why don't you do it ? Is this amount of Rs. 2 lakhs a committed expenditure ? How did you sanction it without the sanction of the Legislature ?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—There are two ways. We will take the sanction of the Legislature and then spend or we will anticipate sanction and then spend and then take sanction.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—So far as the Warehousing Corporation is concerned, there were certain risks in partcipating in its capital. It is not like participating in the capital of a private concern or a Government concern. If tomorrow they raise the capital to Rs. 20 lakhs, are you not bound to make your contribution to it ? Is that not committed expenditure ?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—To the extent that we have contributed, it becomes a committed expenditure.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—In demand No. 52 the Finance Minister is asking for a supplementary grant of Rs. 299 lakhs.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—You must be happy that so much money is being usefully spent.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—More often than not it is not being spent so.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—You will agree that most of these items are very necessary.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I have made a note of several items which are not necessary. If I am allowed time, I would have taken you through them.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—This time we have given you work-wise statements of each item.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Take for instance, page 48 construction of police quarters at Malleswaram. The original estimate was Rs. 90,000 in the Budget for 1960-61. You have already spent up to Rs. 56,000 and now you want an additional grant of Rs. 75,000. So the total will come to more than Rs. 1,20,000.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—I assure you that the whole of it will be spent.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—What is the meaning of increasing the budget estimates like this ?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—What is today's date and how is it that you are going to spend the whole of it before 31st March ?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—We have heard of "bulk without spirit". This is "bulk without sense".

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—In some cases moneys have been spent and in some cases bills have come and therefore additional provision is made.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA .—If you go on rushing expenditure like this at the fag end of the year and taking sanction for supplementary demands, then most of it will remain unspent at the end of the year and it will be a waste. This is the thing which we want to avoid, but you are repeating it year after year. It is very incorrect.

In conclusion I would say it was the duty of the Finance Minister, having regard to the magnitude of the supplementary demands that he has asked for, namely Rs. 16 crores and odd, to have explained to us many important points, namely, from what source he is going to meet this additional expenditure of Rs. 14 crores after making the necessary adjustments and how it is going to react on the surplus budget he had the honour of bringing before the Legislature. With these few words, I wish to thank you very much for the patience with which you have heard me.

† Sri H. S RUDRAPPA (Minister for Forests).—Sir, I would like to reply to one or two points about the Forest Department. One important point raised by the Leader of the Opposition was that the work of supplying sleepers can be done by the department itself, but I wish to bring to the notice of the House that it is not permissible and it is also not economical to conduct this operation by the department. Therefore since a very long time we have entrusted this work of supplying sleepers to the railways through contracts to private persons so that this work could be done as efficiently and as economically as possible. If we take up this work departmentally we have to incur a lot of wasteful expenditure for bringing labour and providing money to them, etc. Even though our officers are expected to be vigilant, they are likely to incur more expenditure and ultimately we may have to come up before this House for additional grants. In that case not only will Government come up for criticism, but there will be waste of money also. This practice has been prevailing for a long time and it is working well.

Sri G. N. PUTTANNA.—What was the reason for changing the contract for supply of sleepers from Agumbe Rama Rao of Shimoga to another party ?

Sri H. S. RUDRAPPA.—It is not advantageous to Government and also not permissible to allow a private party to supply timber to the railways direct. So to prevent smuggling which is likely to occur if we allow a private party to supply sleepers direct to the railways, we have provided that he has to pass through the Forest Department. Otherwise if we allow him, he will go and cut timber and supply any quantity. It is not possible to post police throughout the forest for every tree. Therefore, we have arrived at this arrangement.

Then another point raised was about Khedda operations. Though it was the last Khedda operation, it has proved to be a profitable one.

The total expenditure incurred is about Rs. 1,60,000 and the probable realisation would be Rs. 3,60,000. Therefore there would be a net income of Rs. 2 lakhs from the Khedda operation. The realisation by sale of tickets was Rs. 85,000. Including that and the probable realisation by sale of the elephants and the materials used the total comes to about Rs. 3,60,000 as against an expenditure of Rs. 1,60,000. I hope the Hon'ble Members will be satisfied with these explanations and they will pass the supplementary demands.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಫ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್ (ರಾಜ್ಯಸಾರಿಗೆ, ಗಣಿ ಮತ್ತು ಆಹಾರಶಾಖೆಗಳ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನು ಈ ಮಿನರಲ್ ಡೆವಲಪ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದೆರಡು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಟ್ರಕ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ನಾನು ನಮ್ಮ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್‌ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹಣ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದುಂಟು. ನಾವು ಕಳೆದ ವರ್ಷದಿಂದ ಮಂಗಳೂರು ಬಂದರನ್ನು ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಪಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದೂ ಅನಂತರ ಆ ಬಂದರಿನ ಮೂಲಕವೇ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಐರನ್ ಓರನ್ನು ಸಾಗಿಸುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದೂ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಿ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾವು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ State Trading Corporation ನವರೊಡನೆ ಪತ್ರವ್ಯವಹಾರ ನಡೆಸಿ, ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಿ, ಅವರಿಂದ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾವು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದರೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಆ ಮಿನರಲ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ವ್ಯವಹಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ನಷ್ಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂರನೇ ಎರಡಂಶ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗ ನಾವು ಈ ವ್ಯವಹಾರವನ್ನು ಅವರು ರುಜುಹಾಕಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಲು, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಪೆಸ್ತ್‌ಕೋಸ್ಟ್ ವ್ಯವಹಾರದಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ 66⅔% ಲಾಭ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಣೆಯಿದೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಎರಡನೆಯದಾಗಿ ನಮಗೆ ಹಾನನ-ಮಂಗಳೂರು-ಕಾರ್‌ವಾರ್-ಹುಬ್ಬಳ್ಳಿ ಈ ಮಾರ್ಗವಾಗಿ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಓರನ್ನು ರವಾನೆ ಮಾಡಲು ನಮಗೆ ಟ್ರಕ್ಕುಗಳ ಅಗತ್ಯ ಬಹಳವಾಗಿದೆ. ನಮಗೆ ಸುಮಾರು 200 ಟ್ರಕ್ಕುಗಳು ಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆ ಪೈಕಿ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ 110 ಛಾಸಿಗಳು ಬಂದಿವೆ. 79 ಛಾಸಿಗಳು ಬಾಡಿಕಟ್ಟಿ ಅವುಗಳಿಗೆ ರೋಡ್‌ಮೇಲೆ ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ನಮ್ಮ ಬಂದರುಗಳಿಂದ ಅಂದರೆ ಮಂಗಳೂರು, ಕುಂಟಲ, ಹೊನ್ನಾವರ್ ಈ ಬಂದರುಗಳಿಂದ ಐರನ್ ಓರ್‌ಷಿಪ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ನಮಗೆ ಸಂಡೂರಿನ ಐರನ್ ಓರು ಪ್ರದೇಶದ ಮೇಲೆಲ್ಲಾ ಈ ಬಂದರುಗಳಮೂಲಕವೇ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಮಾಲನ್ನು ನಾವು ಟ್ರಕ್‌ಗಳ ಮೂಲಕವೇ ರವಾನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಆ ಮಿನರಲ್ ಡೆವಲಪ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ನಮಗೆ ಒಂದು ಕಂಡೀಷನ್ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದೇನೆಂದರೆ ನಾವು ಈ ಟ್ರಕ್ಕುಗಳನ್ನು ಬೇರೆ ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಕೊಡಕೂಡದು ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ. ಇವುಗಳನ್ನು ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೇ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ಕಂಡೀಷನ್ನು ಅವರು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ನಾವು ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ 3-4 ರೆಪ್ರೆಸೆಂಟೇಷನ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದರೂ ಅವರು ಒಪ್ಪಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಬಂದರುಗಳಿಂದ ಐರನ್ ಓರ್‌ಷಿಪ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ನಮಗೆ ಈ ವ್ಯವಹಾರದಲ್ಲೇನೂ ನಷ್ಟವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಲಾಭ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭವಿದೆ. ನಾವು ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಮ್ಯಾಂಗನೀಸ್ ಮತ್ತು ಐರನ್ ಓರುಗಳನ್ನು ರವಾನೆಮಾಡಲು ನೂಕ್ಕಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲು ಒಬ್ಬ ಸ್ಪೆಸ್ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪರ್ಟನ್ನು ಕರೆಸಿ ಅತನ ಮೂಲಕ ನಮ್ಮ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪರ್ಟುಗಳು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರ ಫಲವಾಗಿ ಕುಂಸಿ, ಕೊಡಚಾದ್ರಿ, ಕೊಲ್ಲೂರ್‌ಘಾಟ್ ಈ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಿಂದ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಓರನ್ನು 1961ನೇ ಡಿಶಂಬರ್ ವೇಳೆಗೆ ಬಯ್ಯತಕ್ಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭವಿದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ನಮಗೆ ಫಾರಿನ್-ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಚೇಂಜಿನ ಅನುಕೂಲತೆ ಇರುತ್ತೆ. ಮೂರನೇ ಎರಡಂಶ ಲಾಭ ಬರುತ್ತೆ. ನಮಗೆ ಈಗ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಫ್. ಪಾಟೀರ್)

ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರ ಕಡೆಯಿಂದ ವರದಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ನಾವಿನ್ನು ಟೆಂಡರನ್ನು ಕರೆದು ಯಾವ ತರಹ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಟರ್ನ್ ಓವರ್ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗ ಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ಟ್ರಕ್‌ಗಳು ಇಲ್ಲದ ವಿನಾ ಅದು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಹೆಚ್ಚುಹಣ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ತಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಅನುಮೋದಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎಚ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ (ತುಮಕೂರು).—ಈ ಬಾಡಿ ಬಿಲ್ಡಿಂಗನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರಿಗಾದರೂ ಏಕೆ ಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಫ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ರೋಯೆಸ್ ಟೆಂಡರನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆ ವಿವರ ಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ತಿಳಿನುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈಗ ನಧ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಆ ವಿವರಗಳೆಲ್ಲ ನನ್ನಲ್ಲಿಲ್ಲ.

†Sri ANNARAO GANAMUKHI (Minister for Education).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Mr. Mallaradhya has referred to the appointment of 49 Lecturers for a period of one year. The objection taken is why these posts are created only for one year. After the transfer of Colleges to the Government, we assessed the need for appointment of Lecturers in various Colleges and also the allocation as between the Colleges taken over and the University Colleges, has yet to be done. We thought it fit to create these posts for a period of one year and thereafter decide as to how many posts can be created permanently to meet the needs of these Colleges. Therefore, we have created these posts for one year and also we could not fill up those posts permanently because the posts themselves were created temporarily and local candidates were appointed for that period. Now if the intention of the Honourable Member is that the requirements of the Colleges are real and those posts should be created permenently, then I should concede that we will examine that question and wherever there is necessity, we will be able to meet it and these posts would be further continued so that the work may not suffer in all the Colleges.

Again, Sri Mallaradhya has raised a point with regard to the amount which has been met from appropriation from out of different grants to the Mysore University; I think he has interpreted that it is not a new service, while in the Explanatory Note it has been interpreted as a new service. The Finance Department says that in cases of doubt regarding the interpretation of the term, the opinion of the Finance Department is final. Therefore, it is neither left to me, nor to the Honourable Member to interpret as new service or old service or simple service.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—To be on the safest side.

Sri ANNARAO GANAMUKHI.—Sri Mallaradhya has also pointed out some irregularities going on in the University. If the Hon'ble Member gives specific instances in which irregularities are.....

5-00 P.M.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Have I not furnished you a list of 81 cases ?

Sri ANNARAO GANAMUKHI.—Sir, he has addressed a letter to me recounting various irregulatiries and they are being looked into and we will see what action can be taken against those Universities.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA. — Will not the House have the benefi t to know what the allegations are ?

Sri ANNARAO GANAMUKHI.—Sir, at the time of supplementary estimates, I do not think it is necessary. Whatever allegations are there, they are there. If I repeat them here, it will not be of any help to anybody. I will examine them in detail and take action if need be.

†Sri T. MARIAPPA (Minister for Finance).–Mr. Speaker, Sir, before I take up specific cases, I will deal with the general points raised by Hon'ble Member Sri Mallaradhya. Sir, I do not know why to–day he was so uncharitable. He never used to be so on previous occasions Perhaps he wanted to convert this occasion to reply to some of the points raised during the no–confidence motion. If he derives some satisfaction, I have no objection. But, Sir, those remarks are uncharitable so far as debate on the Supplemantary Grants are concerned.

Sir, on more than one occasion, I have stated that the Finance Department is always willing to receive constructive criticisms. We are here to make the House understand the Budget so that there can be proper discussion on the issue. Sir, several other members also criticised the Supplementary Demands on the ground that it is a big sum to the tune of 16 crores. If they had the patience to read the Introductory Memorandum, the whole thing would have been very clear to them. Therefore, I draw the attention of the Members to the Introductor Memorandum. Para 4 of the Memorandum makes it clear that out of the demand of 168.87 lakhs, 506 lakhs is merely on account of accounting adjustments like suspense transations, etc. and the balance of 8.33 crores is covered by Central Assistance. During the course of the year we recoup it from the Government of India. Therefore, only the balance expenditure is asked for and it is before the House.

Sir, Sri Mallaradhya wanted that we should classify the expenditure under revenue expenditure, non-planning expenditure and planning expenditure. I know, he has bestowed lot of thought. But, if he had bestowed a little more thought to capital outlay not met from revenue, Disbursement of Advances and Loans, it would have revealed what the items of expenditure are. Therefore, it is not necessary for me to elaborate the explanation given by the Finance Department.

Then, Sir, he wanted to know the scope of the Contingency Fund. That has been explained on more than one occasion and we have given it to the Members. Sir, he pointed out a few instances where the expenditure was sanctioned, say, in the month of July or August and we have come before this House only now, under the third Supplementary and Additional Grants for the year. The reason is very simple. Whenever the actual expenditure is not incurred, then, there is no need for the Finance Department to include it in the Supplementary demand

(Sri T. MARIYAPPA)

which is placed before the House. Whenever the final Government Order is issued either paying from the contingency or making provision in the additional expenditure, then only we bring it here before the House. Otherwise there is no need to swell the expenditure. Sir, in the first and second instalment we took a supplementary grant of Rs. 348.12 lakhs of which Rs. 87.45 lakhs is on Revenue account Rs. 148.97 lakhs is on account of Capital items and Rs. 111.70 lakhs towards disbursement of loans and advances. Of the total grant thus obtained Rs. 64 lakhs is recoverable by sale of Rice, 1 crore is covered by Central assistance, Rs. 25 lakhs met from funds and an appreciable portion of the demand can be met by reappropriation from other heads. The expenditure on Capital work is unavoidable.

In the third instalment now placed the demand can be roughly analysed as follows :

		Rs.
Development Works, Social Service Departments and Acquisition of assests like trucks, etc.	6.99	crores
Earning more revenue	1.28	,,
Adjustments in accounts	5.06	,,
Recoverable loans	1.61	,,
Interest charges, compensation and pensions	1.17	,,
Total	**16.11**	**crores**
Miscellaneous items like interim relief to Government servants	.08	,,

Sir, of the total of 16.19 crores, about 9 crores is on account of book adjustments, demands covered by Central assistance or for earning more revenue. The balance is mostly on account of capital works and works of a beneficial nature. The net effect this demand will not have full impact on the State's Revenue account as at the end of the year there will be always savings on one account and excesses under others and these demands can be covered by the net savings of all grants put together. Further, these are after all Estimates to obtain Legislative sanction and there is always bound to be some lapses if bills are not received in time as anticipated. It may however be stated that to the extent the expenditure on Capital is increased we need not be sorry for early completion of works even if it means reduction of reserves which are meant for such purposes.

Regarding New Service items, Finance Department has placed only demands which come under the definition and Sri Mallaradhya's reference to experiment investigations, etc., in the case of Mandya Sugar Cane Research is not correct as that item refers only to small experiments of a temporary nature and not to big Research Stations involving outlay of lakhs of rupees.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, the Finance Minister has not mentioned the amount involved in that case *i.e.*, sugar cane Research in Mandya. I say, the Finance Minister is not correct, for the simple reason that he has not mentioned the amount. If Government replies in the end, they will have the last word ; that is our difficulty.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Sri Mallaradhya has raised the question of salaries of Ministers. After all it can be met by reappropriation and no voting is necessary.

He made very uncharitable remarks in referring to the Resources and Economy Committee. Take the case of other State Governments. Some of the State Governments have also appointed such committees, though the nomenclature may be different. Here, it was absolutely essential. In fact in my last budget speech I have made a reference to the need for such a committee and in accordance with that we have appointed the committee. The previous committees, to which Sri Mallaradhya referred, had merely references to the old State of Mysore. The Raghavender Rao Committee made a report before Reorganisation. Subsequently, Dewan Madhava Rao's Committee reported on conditions in old Mysore. If Sri Mallaradhya would recall, he examined the finances of the State and came to the conclusion that they were not very sound, that immediate steps have to be taken to augment the resources. It helped us in the beginning. Now we are already at the end of the second plan. In the meantime we have spent crores of rupees and additional expenditure has been incurred, additional posts have been sanctioned and therefore we want some committee. There are several experts in the committee. I do not admit that all of them are laymen. There are of course laymen and experts. We wanted them to make some scrutiny of the expenditure, scrutiny of the posts sanctioned. Incidentally we also requested them to examine the resources. Naturally for the third plan the magnitude of the resources required is really tremendous. It is not simple.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Why did you not appoint a committee of legislators. You could have had a few experts and constituted a a mixed committee consisting of members and others. That is done even in respect of Parliamentary Committees.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—If he could go through the names, he will find that most of them are legislators.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—You are going on adding to it.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—We have not added at all.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—After Mr. Ramappa what are the names added. You have added two names to the list.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—We have got legislators in the committee. We have two experts in the committee, one is a an industrialist and another is a retired Chief Engineer. We have two retired revenue officers, so

(Sri T. MARIYAPPA)

that all sides of the question could be very suitably examined and their experience brought to bear on the issues involved. Suffice it to say that we expect the Committee to work well, give us very valuable suggestions. They have submitted an interim report which is very valuable and which will help the Government to frame policies very easily.

Sir, Sri Mallaradhya also referred to the question of payment for street lighting in Mysore. Correspondence on this question went on for a long time. With regard to the ornamental lighting in Mysore, the municipality disowned all responsibility. We made a reference to the palace and they also disowned all responsibility. Ultimately for a city like Mysore, we could not remove all the lamps. Therefore we had to incur that expenditure.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Now that you have sanctioned 8 lakhs on this item; Bangalore will claim the same thing. Other city municipalities will claim it. Is there no policy behind it ? Merely because the municipality disowned responsibility, you cannot straightaway sanction 8 lakhs. A time will come when Bangalore will demand 20 lakhs.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Let the claim come, we will examine it, This is an old claim.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—You are indirectly committing the State to such expenditure. This is a serious matter.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—There is no precedence involved in this. This is a special case.

In regard to the Demand No. 27, item 12, Sri Mallaradhya has used the occasion to ventilate his grievance in regard to the non-issue of a licence to Mr. Gopalan. I want to leave the matter at that because the Chief Minister has sufficiently and effectively answered the point. Probably Mr. Mallaradhya was not present in the House then. The item mentioned here is a simple one :

"According to the Arbitration Award in the dispute case between the State Government and Messrs. Vellum Parachute Silk Co., Government had to accept the Award of Rs. 9,49,172.77 to be paid against the claim of Rs. 10,10,114-6-0 of the company....."

Government had to accept the award. Moreover this is a case not intiated by the present Government but by Reddy's Government. It was pending for a long time. Ultimately the arbitrators came to a conclusion and we had to accept the award. The case was a straigtforward one and we have to accept it. I am not going to subscribe to the point of Sri Mallaradhya. This was not the reason for refusing the licence to him. In fact no licence is refused. On the other hand, the State Government has recommended his case.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The Chief Minister has not spoken the truth. I know the facts and I can challenge that the Chief Minister has

not recommended the case of these two persons to the Centre. Even now, I am prepared to apologise to the Chief Minister if the Chief Minister would prove to my satisfaction that the cases were really forwarded to the Centre. It is not a correct statement.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—He has also given an explanation.....

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I want the Hon'ble Speaker to get the records and verify whether I am true or the Chief Minister is true.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—It becomes a charged item. Sri Mallaradhya has made much of advances to industrial concerns. If the note appended to Demand No. 27 is read Members will be pleased to see that we have given roughly 78 lakhs. The explanations are quite self-explanatory. "Owing to increased rates for sandalwood oil and increase in the sandalwood auction rates, higher cost for Sandalwood is to be provided for which is estimated at about Rs. 33.89 lakhs. According to the recent decision of Government the Sandalwood Oil Factory has to pay Sales-Tax on Sandalwood supplied by the Forest Department from 1st October 1957....." Similarly explanations to item 2 and 3 are very clear. There is nothing vague about it. Similarly other items. If any more explanation is to be given, I am prepared to give them to the House.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—My objection with regard to that matter was that this is bad planning for industrial production. When you have a plan for the next year, so far as production is concerned, what is the amount that you have got to provide? What is going to be your production by way of Sandalwood oil or other product. Was it suddenly found that more money was required ?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—The budget provision was found to be insufficient. That is why we have come for additional grants.

Then page No. 29. Mr. Mallaradhya has been very uncharitable with regard to expenditure under Demand No. 29. In this House on more than one occasion Hon'ble Members have pressed that we should spend more for rural communication and bridges. The Government expected atleast appreciation of the work done in this behalf, though not compliments. So far as minor bridges are concerned when the grant was only 40 lakhs, the Public Works Department was able to spend 86 lakhs.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—How was the Public Works Minister able to spend.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—That was the speed with which the Department functioned. You will please remember what we stated in the beginning of the third year of the second five-year plan. The whole machinery has been geared up and its initial teething troubles were over.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—How could it ever happen. When you have sanctioned 40 lakhs, the Public Works Minister goes on spending 80 lakhs. Is that permissible ? I consider it as a serious matter for any Minister to take liberties with the finances of the State.

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

How did the Cabinet with a sense of joint responsibility allow a particular Minister with a particular port-folio to spend 100 per cent more than what is scheduled in the Budget ? It is not that I am not appreciative of the work. I have got a lot to say about it. I will take another opportunity. But I want to know how a particular Minister could take liberties with the Finance Department ?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—You are missing the very principle of supplementary grants. What is provided in the Budget is not sacrosanct. Sir, in a developing economy, we should always be prepared to provide more funds so that all works of public utility and works of an essential nature should be executed.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Not in respect of items not included in the Budget, not at the cost of works included in the Budget.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—These items are included in the Budget my dear Sir.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, you need not make an election stunt of this. I am talking of the fundamental principle of finance. You are making an election speech.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಲ್. ನರಸಿಂಹಯ್ಯ.—ರೂರಲ್ಲು ಕಮ್ಯೂನಿಕೇಷನ್ಸಿಗಾಗಿ ನೀವೇ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ಹಿಂದೆಯೇ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಿರಿ.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Scarcity Conditions – So far as scarcity conditions are concerned, even if all the money is spent, I have no objection.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲೇ ಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

Sri G. B. SHANKAR RAO.—We cannot completely ignore the remarks made by Hon'ble Member Sri Mallaradhya, because the Superintending Engineer, Bangalore Circle, has exceeded the limit laid down by the G.O. He has done a road mileage of 3,800 as against the total length of 7,000 miles for the whole State. Is there any sense of proportion in this ?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—There cannot be 3,900 miles in one circle.

Sri G. B. SHANKAR RAO.—I can substantiate it. I wish to bring out the whole figures and verify it. There is rural communication roads of 7,000 miles for the whole State, but Bangalore Circle alone it is 3,900 for a circle consisting of 32 taluks.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Then he referred to Malaprabha Development Scheme of 30 lakhs. The whole explanation is very clear under this grant. I have no objection to place details before. They are not readily available with me.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I shall be happy if the amount is going to be spent during the year. ಮೂವ್ವತ್ತು ಲಕ್ಷವನ್ನೇಕೆ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Sir, then finally he raised the question of contributions to State Warehousing Corporation. He wanted me to state whether it is a committed expenditure. Sir, in the case of the Central Warehousing Corporation, it is agreed to make further contribution of 2 lakhs. Naturally we have to make equal contribution.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Supposing next year they come out with an increased share capital of 20 lakhs. Will you be able to contribute 10 lakhs next year? Is that a committed expenditure?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—We will examine that. The whole thing is regulated by policy. You say 'suppose'; it is itself the answer. Don't suppose; you give us facts and we will be able to answer it properly.

These are most of the points raised by Sri Mallaradhya. There are one or two points to be answered. Some of the Hon'ble Members raised certain points. It was decided that while effecting promotions of Thahsildars, the Deputy Thahsildars of the South Kanara District who may have held the posts of Deputy Thahsildars, should be preferred and they will have to take their chances in their respective Divisions. It may also be that many of the Deputy Thahsildars are against the ranking and the matter stands there.

There was also a reference to the Community Development programme even in South Kanara. Almost all the taluks have been covered by community development programme in South Kanara For a population of 2,80,000, they are allowable two blocks according to the standards adopted by the Ministry of Community Development.

It cannot be discrimination. It is based on the population of that taluk, 1,80,000.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Sir, when I raised the question, Government refused to give a single block. They said that the Government of India will give one block to a taluk and not to a portion of a taluk. On that ground the Government were refusing to give even one single block. They have given one block to Kamadurga which is the Congress area and they have not given it to my area. That is why I say they have broken the rule and given a block to the Congress area. But the Minister is saying something else. That is not my grievance.

5-30 P.M.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Then a question was raised about the upgrading of the courts of the Sub-Magistrates and Additional Magistrates in the old Madras area.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—You please tell us what happened to the Government Order.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Allotment of blocks usually depends upon the population of a taluk.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—It is made on party basis.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—I refuse it. In fact my friend Sri Chamaiah from the Opposition got it much earlier than others.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—It might have been a chance like lottery.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Please tell us whether you have repated the Government Order or you have gone beyond that.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH (Minister for Public Works).—I am a Congressman. I was a Minister and I am a Minister now. I may say that Maddur Taluk did not get one still. Blocks are not given on party basis. Even if certain taluks are left out, ultimately all taluks will be covered.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA (Minister for Local Self-Government).—While granting Blocks we have taken into account the percentage of coverage. If a district has been covered to the extent of 80% then we do not give to that district, but prefer a district which has not been covered to that extent. This has nothing to do with the political party to which a particular representative of the people belongs. In my own taluka the N. E. S. Block was given at a time when it was represented by a non-Congres sman.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಎಸ್. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ.—Portion of talukಗೆ ಬ್ಲಾಕ್ ಕೊಡಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ಕೆಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಡೈರೆಷನ್ ಇದೆ. ಆದರಿಂದ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಬ್ಲಾಕನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Then there was a question regarding up-grading of the Courts of Sub-Magistrates and Additional Magistrates of the old Madras area. The notification regarding the up-grading with effect from 1st April 1961 has been sent to the High Court for inclusion of the specific jurisdiction of each court.

As regards the actual promotion of the Sub-Magistrates, the High Court have proposed promotion of 13 Sub-Magistrates under powers vested in them under rule 15 (a) of the Cadre and Recruitment Rules for Munsiffs. Out of these 13, two names proposed were not in the list originally sent by the High Court. A clarification has been sought from the High Court.

As regards the progress regarding the enquiry regarding the disturbances in Mysore and Bangalore in connection with the Youth Festival in Mysore, only one witness remains to be Examined. One Superintendent of Police could not attend the enquiry so far. The next hearing is posted for 14th. We may expect the report before the end of this month.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—In the Bangalore case I had offered to give evidence before the Divisional Commissioner. He is to retire on the 26th. He has sent a letter to me today asking me to appear before him. To my enquiry, I was told that compensation of Rs. 10,000 was paid to the relatives of this boy.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—My information is that only one witness remains to be examined.

Coming to the Malaprabha Project, this project in Belgaum District was contemplated by the former Government of Bombay and included in the Second Five-Year Plan of that State for giving irrigation facilities to the areas of Bijapur, Belgaum and Dharwar Districts, which are subject to periodical visitations of famine. Since the reorganisation of States and the consequent merger of those areas in Mysore State, the Scheme has been finalised and forwarded to the Central Water and Power Commission and the Planning Commission, Government of India, for technical clearance. The project is estimated to cost Rs.20 crores and it envisages the construction.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Let him substantiate his case.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—A provision of Rs. 100 lakhs for the project exists in the Second Five-Year Plan of the Mysore State. The Planning Commission and the Central Water and Power Commission are expected to accord administrative and technical clearance respectively to the project shortly. In the meanwhile scarcity conditions having once again affected the area last year, it became extremely urgent and necessary to provide mass employment and other relief to the people of the tract. Therefore, in order to provide employment opportunities to the people of the scarcity affected area on the scale that the situation demanded and also to utilise as much of the provision made for it during the Second Plan period as possible, it became necessary to start work on the Malaprabha project immediately, Government, therefore, accorded sanction to the formations of one Public Works Department Circle, two Divisions and ten Sub-Divisions with the necessary staff for taking up the work of the Malaprabha project. The Chief Engineer was also directed to arrange for the expeditious execution of the preliminary works and to spend the provision made in the Plan, *viz.*, Rs. 100 lakhs by 31st March 1961. A programme of works for the project was also approved by Government. As there was a grant of only Rs. 20,000 in the sanctioned budget estimates for the year 1960-61 it became necessary to provide an additional grant of Rs. 30,00,000 from the Contingency Fund to enable the expenditure during the current year being met.

"...Hence sanction to the additional grant of Rs. 30 lakhs provided under Demand No. 46 is ncessary."

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Are you satisfied with that explanation Mallaprabha project is a project at an estimated cost of Rs. 100 lakhs ? What has that to do with scarcity conditions ?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—It is earth work.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ಮಾರ್ಚ್ 30 ರೊಳಗೆ 30 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡು ತ್ತೀರ ಎಂದರೆ ಯಾರು ನಂಬುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—Scarcity conditions ಬಂದಾಗ ಇದೇ ಹಾಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೋಟಿಗಟ್ಟಲೆ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಿರಿ—ರೋಡುಗಳು, ಟ್ಯಾಂಕುಗಳು, ರೆಸ್ಟೋರೇಶನ್ ವರ್ಕ್ ಮತ್ತು ಗೋ ಕಟ್ಟೆಗಳನ್ನು ಎರೆಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೋ ಅರೆಲ್ಲಾ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ಅಕ್ಕೋಬರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ಆರ್ಡರ್ ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. Administrative Division form ಮಾಡಿ, 30 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ನ್ಯಾಯವಿದೆಯೇ, ರೆಕಾಮ್ಮಂಡೇಷನ್ ವಿದೆಯೇ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಕೆ. ವೀರಣ್ಣಗೌಡ.—ಅರ್ಥ ವರ್ಕಿಗೆ ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಜಿಂಕ್‌ಶೀಟ್ಸ್ ಮುಂತಾದ ಮೆಟೀರಿಯಲ್ಲುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಂಡು ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನೂಪರಿಂಡೆಂಟಿಗ್ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರಿಂದ ಹಿಡಿದು ಬಾಕಿ ನೌಕರರುಗಳವರೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಳ ಸಾರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲಾ 30ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ದೊಡ್ಡದಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—With these remarks, I commend the Supplementary Estimates for the acceptance of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I will now put the Demands in respect of the Additional and Supplementary Grants. The question is:

"That the further sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the List of Demands for Additional and Supplementary Grants for the year 1960-61, circulated to the Members be granted to Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March, 1961 in respect of Demands Nos. 1, 5, 7-A, 8, 10, 13, 14, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 29, 35, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46, to 49, 51 to 53, 55 and 58."

The motion was adopted

(*As directed by the Chair the motions for Demands for Additional and Supplementary Grants which were granted to the House are reproduced below.*)

DEMAND NO. 1 TAXES ON INCOME OTHER THAN CORPORATION TAX.

4. *Taxes on Income other than Corporation Tax*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 30,300 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'Taxes on Income other than Corporation Tax'."

DEMAND NO. 5—FOREST.

10. *Forest*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 37,90,300 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'Forest'."

DEMAND NO. 7-A—SALES TAX—ADMINISTRATION.

12. *A. Sales Tax.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 60,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'Sales Tax'."

DEMAND NO. 8—OTHER TAXES—ADMINISTRATION.

13. *Other Taxes and Duties.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 6,14,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'Other Taxes and Duties'."

DEMAND NO. 10.—IRRIGATION.

18. *Other Revenue Expenditure finance from Ordinary Revenues.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 33,00,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'Other Revenue Expenditure financed from Ordinary Revenues'."

DEMAND NO. 13.—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION.

25. *General Administration (Except the sub-major heads B and C).*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 8,57,390 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'General Administration' (Except the sub-major heads B and C)'."

DEMAND NO. 14.—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION (STATE LEGISLATURE AND ELECTION CHARGES).

25. *General Administration (B Parliament and the State Legislature and C. Elections).*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 3,48,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'General Administration (State Legislature and Election Charges)."

(Mr. Deputy Speaker)

Demand No. 17.—Police.

29. *Police.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 21,00,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'Police'."

Demand No. 19 Scientific Departments.

36. *Scientific Departments.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 3,77.600 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'Scientific Departments'."

Demand No. 20.—Education.

37. *Education.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 25,00,400 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'Education'."

Demand No. 21.—Medical.

38. *Medical.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 9,94,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of Payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'Medical'."

Demand No. 22.—Public Health.

39. *Public Health.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 100 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'Public Health'."

Demand No. 23.—Agriculture, Horticulture and Fisheries.

40. *Agriculture.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 300 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'Agriculture'."

DEMAND NO. 24.—RURAL DEVELOPMENT.

40-*A. Rural Development.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 24,58,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'Rural Development'."

DEMAND NO. 27.—INDUSTRIES INCLUDING SERICULTURE AND CAPITAL OUTLAY ON INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT.

43. *Industries and Supplies.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 78,73,900 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of Payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'Industries and Supplies'."

DEMAND NO. 29.—CIVIL WORKS.

50. *Civil Works.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs, 1,00,00,100 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'Civil Works'."

DEMAND NO. 35.—SUPERANNUATION ALLOWANCES AND PENSIONS.

55. *Superannuation Allowances and Pensions.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 22,61,900 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'Superannuation Allowances and Pensions'."

DEMAND NO. 38.—MISCELLANEOUS.

57. *Miscellaneous.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 72,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'Miscellaneous'."

DEMAND NO. 40.—COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, ETC.

63-B. *Community Development Projects, National Extension Service and Local Development Works.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 8,00,100 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'Community Development Projects, National Extension Service and Local Development Works'."

(MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER)

DEMAND NO. 42.—WORKING EXPENSES—IRRIGATION WORKS—COMMERCIAL.

XVII I.N.E. and D. Works (Commercial)—Working Expenses.

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs.2,00,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'I.N.E. & D. Works (Commerical) Working Expenses'."

DEMAND NO. 44.—ROAD AND WATER TRANSPORT SCHEMES.

XLVI-A. Receipts from Road and Water Transport Schemes—Working Expenses.

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 77,00,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'Receipts from Road and Water Transport Schemes—Working Expenses'."

DEMAND NO. 46.—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON IRRIGATION.

68. *Construction of I.N.E. and D. Works (Commercial).*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 70,00,100 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'construction of I.N.E. and D. Works—Commercial'."

DEMAND NO. 47.—IRRIGATION WORKS—NON-COMMERCIAL.

68-*A. Construction of I.N.E. and D. Works (Non-Commercial).*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 200 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'Construction of I.N.E. and D. Works—Non-Commercial'."

DEMAND NO. 48.—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH.

70. *Capital Outlay on Improvement of Public Health.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 2,10,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Improvement of Public Health'."

DEMAND NO. 49.—INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT.

72. *Capital Outlay on Industrial Development.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 1,08,99,500 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Industrial Development'."

DEMAND NO. 51.—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON CIVIL WORKS.

81. *Capital Account of Civil Works outside the Revenue Account.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs.2,99,89,500 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'Capital Account of Civil Works outside the Revenue Account'."

DEMAND NO. 52.—CAPITAL ACCOUNT OF ELECTRICITY SCHEMES OUTSIDE THE REVENUE ACCOUNT.

81-*A Capital Outlay on Electricity Schemes.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 3,78,64,100 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Electricity Schemes'."

DEMAND NO. 53.—CAPITAL ACCOUNT OF OTHER WORKS OUTSIDE THE REVENUE ACCOUNT.

82. *Capital Account of other Works outside the Revenue Account.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 2,15,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'Capital Account of other Works outside the Revenue Account'."

DEMAND NO. 55.—COMMUTED VALUE OF PENSIONS.

83. *Payments of Commuted Value of Pensions.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 7,800 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year endnig 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'payment of Commuted Value of pensions'."

(Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER)

DEMAND NO. 58.—ADVANCES AND LOANS.

P. Loans and Advances by State Government.

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 1,60,50,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'Loans and Advances by the State Government'."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER—The House now rises and will meet tomorrow at One p.m.

The House adjourned at Forty-Five Minutes Past Five of the Clock, to meet again at One of the Clock on Tuesday, the 14th March 1961.

WD 6170—GPB—(L.A. New Br.)—500—9-12-66